

appropriated in 1874 for the expenses of the Boston Water Works, and \$25,000 for water supply of the

ministerial rent, \$12,272 have been expended for this department; what becomes of the balance of \$18,721? Well, it is pretty evident it has been expended for some other purpose, for it is not in the treasury. If the different sums appropriated but not expended for the purposes designed had remained in the treasury, the ministers would not perhaps have borrowed \$120,000, some \$40,000 of which they have expended. Now if this state of affairs is allowed to go on, Mr. President, would it be as well to say at once to the people—"Proceed, and run the country in debt, and expend the money to suit yourselves; and it is unnecessary to have any more sessions of the Legislature, for you don't regard its authority."

Again, in regard to money misapplied. The receipts from government lands were \$38,460. By the law of Jan. 1, 1864, these receipts were set apart for paying the government bonds; now Mr. Pres-

by the law? The answer is, they have not, but have applied the money to other purposes. Instead of decreasing at all by these means by law provided, the public debt is increasing. Had these diversions of money from their legitimate purposes been done on account of some pressing demand, or some impending danger to the country, the Legislature might find therein an excuse for the ministers; but the expenditure of large sums for purposes of no possible benefit to the country, appears to my mind in the nature of a serious crime, the commission of a counterpart of which in private life would consign the guilty party to a lengthy imprisonment with hard labor.

Let me ask, Mr. President, by what authority have these ministers incurred a debt of \$180,000 in

save them permission to expend \$40,000 of that sum? The only authority is that of their own wills, and therefore the responsibility of payment should be theirs alone. But some one may say—"there's no use in crying for spilt milk." That may be true; but it is evident that we can have no confidence in these ministers in the future. If they are allowed to go on unchecked in the way they have, a very brief time will suffice to bankrupt the government. The \$90,000 borrowed by them is now lying in the treasury, with interest accruing to swell the public debt.

on that can be given for borrowing that money is that it was for the purpose of making good that which was lost by the late Government.

Look at the huge bill of appropriations for the ensuing two years, which ministers have submitted, apparently with the reckless intention of putting the public in the belief that the Government's debt can never be removed; for they have not proposed or suggested any means by which the deficiency is to be supplied, whereas, in fact, the Government are now £1,000,000 in debt. They propose to appropriate £75,025 more than the sum total of the bill of 1874, but this sum, which to us appears so large, is doubtless a mere trifle to the Government, and they have no more without our authority;—they don't need any authority from us, and in fact, the authority of the Legislature is not required.

On the depreciated point, the question to be asked is, what business had the ministers to receive money which they knew was not a legal tender?—and if they were not to be asked to answer for it, then; what could the Minister of Finance mean by taking those coins into his treasury, knowing as we must have known (for he is an experienced man) that the Government were incurring a great loss, and that such a transaction has a bad look. Mr. President, as though money was to be made by somebody through the Government, and that the Government were to receive the coin, that this uncurrent money should be taken in. By this transaction, the government will probably

that this upon the 1st of August, 1874, and he received of the minister a receipt for the same. He also advised that the minister may receive on deposit sums of not less than fifty dollars, and issue certificates therefor, the money so received to be held as a special deposit for the redemption of such certificates. The minister thus has no authority to issue the deposits, but we have no objection to his doing so. The bank of Bismarck deposited with the minister \$10,000, under the act of August, 1874, and that the minister proceeded to open the bags and mixed the money with that already in the treasury. This was clearly a serious violation of the act, and we have no objection to a resolution of the House, in consequence of the same, to suspend the resolution of want of confidence in the present advisers of His Majesty.

Supreme Court—July Term.

The term commenced on Monday the 5d, First As
sociate Justice Harris presiding. The following is a
resume of the business done up to yesterday :

The King vs. Conban; having possession of opium.
Plead guilty and sentenced to two months' im-
prisonment.

The King vs. Ahl. The same. Two months.

The King vs. Lamyat. The same. Ples of not
guilty. Verdict of acquittal.

The King vs. J. C. Culver. Forgery. Verdict of
not guilty.

A correspondent hands us the following question in interest and percentage for some of our young men:

"The U. S. Government agree to loan to the Shah of Persia nine million of dollars, and the interest is to be determined in this manner: Whatever percentage forty-five thousand dollars will pay on a profit of nine millions—this percentage shall be the interest for the month of the year."

agrees to pay. Now this nine million is to be retained by the Shah until it amounts to eighteen million. Then the Shah is to make the Government of England pay 12 s. On what year, what day, and what hour, will the nine million and the interest payable? And is further stipulated by the U. S. Government, that in the case the Shah should not pay the exact hour, that the Shah shall pay an extra one and seven-eighths per cent—on the original amount, nine million—on the interest for the day, month, or year, that he should not pay. Very simple, but will be a good exercise for the mind of a mathematician. The calculation to be made is simple interest."

sond. Unless, however, his case is taken up by the American Government, of which there seems to be considerable doubt, he will probably not be able to get the assistance of British authorities. The Admiralty, however, is likely to look much more seriously upon the conduct of Captain Stevens, of the *Barraclough*, in committing such an indiscretion as to get into a conflict with the Samoans, which led to the death of several of his men. Colonel Steinberger will, in all likelihood, be an important witness in the inquiry which must be held."

After speaking of the "temperate and full account" of the Samoa difficulty which was presented to the COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER, the *Herald* goes on to say:

"Apart from its merits there are other features which are of interest to the public."

any of our ships have interfered at all. The soldiers of the United States are not to be taken from their posts and retention in others, the imprisonment without trial and the subsequent landing on a foreign shore, make it to be desired that Consul Foster should be permitted to send the United States ship which Captain Stevens so unaccountably rushed in to perform. Colonel Steinberger has preserved a rigid silence throughout. Probably he does not consider it his own ships of war to do the work of our own government, and of this he is of course the best judge. We must be content to wait for news from England and America, and hear what action they take. I am not at all disposed to say that we can safely say that there is evidently much that needs explanation in the conduct of Captain Stevens and of the United States Consul, with reference not only to the seizure, but to the subsequent treatment of the prisoners, and to the subsequent release of one which there seems to us neither warrant nor excuse.